## Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TATYANA DREVALEVA, Plaintiff,

v.

JOSEPH GLAZER, et al., Defendants. Case No. 21-cv-00500-JCS Also Filed in Case No. 18-cv-03748-WHA

ORDER GRANTING APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS

**SUA SPONTE REFERRAL TO** DETERMINE WHETHER CASES ARE RELATED

Re: Dkt. No. 2

Plaintiff Tatyana Drevaleva, pro se, has applied to proceed in forma pauperis. Good cause having been shown, that application is GRANTED.

As Drevaleva acknowledges in her complaint and application to proceed in forma pauperis, her claims arise from essentially the same facts as a number of other cases she has filed, all of which were assigned to the Honorable William Alsup based on his determination that they were related cases. The Ninth Circuit recently issued a memorandum opinion remanding one of those cases (which was assigned case number 18-cv-03748-WHA in this Court) for further proceedings, although a mandate has not yet issued. See Drevaleva v. Dep't of Veterans Affairs, F. App'x , No. 19-16395, 2020 WL 6778779 (9th Cir. Nov. 18, 2020). This case is therefore REFERRED sua sponte under Civil Local Rule 3-12(c) to Judge Alsup to determine whether it is related to case number 18-cv-03748-WHA and the other cases related to that case. Any party

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The other cases are *Drevaleva v. United States*, No. 19-cv-01454-WHA (N.D. Cal.); *Drevaleva* v. U.S. Dep't of Veterans Affairs, No. 19-cv-02665-WHA (N.D. Cal.); Drevaleva v. Dep't of Veterans Affairs, No. 19-cv-05927-WHA (N.D. Cal.); Drevaleva v. Dep't of Veterans Affairs, No. 19-cv-06127-WHA (N.D. Cal.); and Drevaleva v. United States, No. 20-cv-00820-WHA (N.D. Cal.).

## Case 1:21-cv-00761-WJ-JFR Document 304 Filed 01/25/21 Page 2 of 2

United States District Court Northern District of California

may file a response supporting or opposing finding the cases relate	ed no later than January 29
2021. See Civ. L.R. 3-12(c), 3-12(e), 7-11(b).	

Issues of the sufficiency of the complaint for the purpose of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and service of process will be resolved after determination of whether the cases are related.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 25, 2021

JOSEPH C. SPERO Chief Magistrate Judge